



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in the Breviary, or authorized prayer-book of the Roman Catholic clergy, and which, be it remembered, they are obliged to read daily under pain of mortal sin. Surely, if there be such a thing as *unity* in the Church of Rome, it ought to be found in the *revelations* of these two saintly and highly-gifted ladies.

Let us see. We begin with St. Catherine—

"The Eternal Word," says she, in Orati. xliii. p. 236, "is given to us by the means of Mary, and of the substance of Mary. He clothed himself with our nature, without taint of original sin; because this conception was not by the operation of man, but by the operation of the Holy Spirit, which was not so in Mary, because she proceeded from the seed of Adam, not by the operation of the Holy Spirit, but of Man; and because all this seed was tainted and corrupt, therefore, this nature could not be infused into uncorrupt matter, nor properly could it be purified except by the grace of the Holy Spirit, which grace the body cannot receive, but the reasonable or intellectual Spirit, and, therefore, Mary could not be cleansed from this stain, except after the soul was infused into the body, which thing was thus done by the holy power of the Divine Word, which was to enter into this vessel. Wherefore, as the furnace speedily consumes the drop of water, thus did the Holy Spirit with the stain of original sin; because, after her conception, suddenly she was cleansed from this sin by the great grace given to her."—See the Epistles and Prayers of the Seraphic Virgin St. Catherine of Sienna. Published in Venice by Frederick Torresano, 1548, and to be found in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.*

St. Thomas Aquinas himself, or Cardinal Cajetan, could not have expressed themselves more strongly against the modern doctrine of "pia sententia," or in favour of the ancient opinion, that the Blessed Virgin was conceived after the manner of men, and not exempt from the stain of original sin.

We now proceed to St. Brigit, and, strange though it be, nothing can be more contradictory than her revelations to those of St. Catherine. Had they changed places, indeed, as widow and virgin, the discrepancy might, perhaps, have been less surprising, though equally contradictory. We quote from a folio volume in Latin, entitled "Revelationes Sanctæ Birgittæ, a Consalvo Durante notis illustratæ," printed at Cologne in 1628.*

In the first book, ch. 9, she introduces the Blessed Virgin Mary as telling her that "her parents came together out of divine love, against their own will," and in book 6, ch. 49, as stating in express terms—"I was conceived without original sin, and not in sin; for, as my Son and I never sinned, so no marriage ever was more honourable than that from which I came forth."

If, then, St. Catherine was plain the one way, here we have St. Brigit equally express the other. Saints, it appears, differ as well as doctors. What are the faithful to do amid such perplexities?

We stated in our last number that Cardinal Cajetan wrote a work expressly upon the subject of the Immaculate Conception, and that he strongly takes the part of the opponents of that doctrine.

We were anxious to see whether so learned a writer had overlooked these revelations, but he did not; for in p. 206 he expressly refers to both St. Brigit's and St. Catherine's revelations, and states that he thinks very little credit is due to St. Brigit's, though he considers St. Catherine's more worthy of credit.*

On the other hand, we are informed by "the Revelations of St. Brigit" that they were examined by Cardinal de Turre-Cremata, by order of the Council of Bale, and that he approved of them as useful for the instruction of the

faithful, which, it is to be supposed, he would not have done if he had not believed them to be true revelations.*

Pope Benedict XIV., however, appears to have taken a somewhat safer middle course, consistent with their being either true or false, according to the taste or private judgment of the faithful; though we confess we think in so grave a question as, whether certain alleged revelations did or did not come from God, pontifical infallibility might have condescended to tell the world whether they ought to believe them or not. We take the passage verbatim, to save trouble, from the life of St. Brigit in the Young Christian's Library, published by Mr. Duffy, p. 22:—

"The approbation of similar revelations implies simply, that after mature examination it is permitted to publish them for the utility of the faithful. . . . Although they do not merit the same credence as the truths of religion, we may believe them with human faith, conformably to the rules of prudence, according to which they are probable, and based on sufficient motives for pious belief."—Benedict XIV.*

According to Pope Benedict's advice, and conformably to the rules of prudence and human faith, we apprehend it would be the wisest course to discard all such private revelations as either the ravings of fanaticism or contrivances of imposture, deserving only of contempt; but we are not now considering what we or others ought now to do or say, but what eminent Roman Catholic theologians have already said on the one side and the other touching these pretended revelations; and we can hardly help smiling at the earnestness and ingenuity with which the conflicting patrons of these rival enthusiasts advocated their respective favourites in this miserable conflict.

Cardinal Bellarmine, of course, backs St. Brigit as favouring his side of the controversy, but goes no further than this, "that the divine revelations which St. Brigit testifies that she had are not to be despised, since they were diligently examined and approved of by men of the greatest weight."†

Father Papebroche, in the Acta Sanctorum (tom xii., 30 April, p. 858), disputes the genuineness of the passage we have given from St. Catherine's oratio xiv.,* because it is not found in the Latin edition printed at Cologne in 1553, which he states was printed from the autograph MS. of Raymundus de Vineis of Capua, the confessor of St. Catherine.

On the other hand, the learned Echard, in his "Scriptores Ordinis Prædicatorum,"† in the life of St. Catherine, shows clearly that the Cologne edition of 1553 was not printed from an autograph of Raymundus; and that the passage was found not only in the Italian (from which we have given it), and in which it was originally written from St. Catherine's dictation in her vernacular tongue, but also in the earlier Latin translation printed at Brescia (Brixii), in 1496, more than half a century before. Echard says distinctly, p. 837, that the Cologne edition mutilated oratio xvi., and that the omission of the passage was, doubtless, owing to the theological scruples of the editor, Theodoric Lober a Stratis, or the prejudices of the transcriber of the MS. from which it was taken. To which he adds the following instructive piece of information by way of caution, viz.:—"That such omissions were frequent in the 14th and 15th centuries, with respect to this controversy, transcribers suppressing such things as made against the 'pious opinion' which they held."

Echard further refers to two MSS. in the Bodleian Library, at Oxford, Nos. 1781 and 3085, which we regret we have not been able to refer to, but which, if of earlier date than the Cologne copy, we have no doubt follow the original Italian. That the original had some such passage in it further appears from the "Summa" of Saint Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence (canonized by Pope Adrian VI.), which appeared in 1449, in which (part i. lib. 8, cap. 2) he distinctly asserts that "while St. Brigit is said to have had revelations of this kind, it should be known that other saints who were distinguished by their miracles (as St. Catherine of Sienna) had a revelation to the contrary."‡ Antoninus, we ought to add, was nearly contemporaneous with St. Catherine, as she died in 1380, and he was born in 1389.

Papebroche, on the other hand, charges Vincentius Bandellus de Castro Novo, or some such opponent of the "pia

sententia," with having interpolated the passage in the Brescian edition of 1496—"In quo fingitur S. Catharina de Virginis Deiparæ conceptione loqui ad Patrem Æternum, eique dicere quod conceptio fuerit maculata ut ceterorum hominum; sic tamen ut mox superveniens gratia maculam absterserit." But to this Echard replies triumphantly, that Vincentius Bandellus was a man of the highest character—omni exceptione major—and (what may be considered by modern readers still more conclusive) that he was born in 1435, and therefore was only fourteen years of age when Antoninus's work appeared in 1449, in which work the statement as to St. Catherine's contrary revelation was published, as before stated. As to the insinuation, that if the passage was not forged by Bandellus it was by some other, Echard properly treats it as a mere gratuitous assumption, devoid of all proof, and too vague to be worthy of attention. We may add, that even if this could account for the passage in the Latin edition of Brescia, it would not get rid of the evidence of the numerous copies extant in the vernacular Italian, in which language even Theodoric, the editor of the Cologne edition of 1553, admits that they were delivered by St. Catherine, as appears not only in the heading of the orations, fol. clxxx. b., but in the very title of the book itself, which calls it, "e idiomate Italico in Latinam transfusa."

Of course, Consalvo Durante,* the editor of the Revelations of St. Brigit, and those who follow him, such as the Jesuits Suarez† and Salmeron,‡ are very much shocked at Cardinal Cajetan's assertion as to St. Catherine's counter revelations, and stoutly accuse him of falsehood in stating that St. Antoninus and the Blessed Raymund of Capua made any mention of them. They appear, however, to have either grossly and, we think, wilfully, misstated St. Antoninus (though just before referring to the very passage which shows that it is a mis-statement, tit. 8, c. 2), or to have intended to get out of the difficulty by a quibble, endeavouring to confound between the "Summa" of Antoninus, in which the passage occurs, and his "Chronicorum tertia pars," which contains "a life of St. Catherine," but only treats of her revelations in a general way, without particularising those in question.† As to Raymund, Durante and his followers seem either to have been altogether ignorant of the existence of the Italian and earlier Latin edition (Brixii, 1496), or were again making a quibbling distinction between Raymund's "Life of St. Catherine" and the "treasures and prayers" published with it, and purporting to be taken down from the mouth of Catherine herself, when in a state of rapture or ecstasy. Why should the writer also insert the details of her revelations in her life, when he was publishing them all at the same time in extenso at the end of same volume?

Who after reading thus far (if any of our readers have had the patience to do so), can fail to lament that the talents of learned men should ever have been wasted on such absurdities, or that will not agree with Echard and St. Antoninus, when they deprecate acting on such evidence, and after confronting the two rival revelations, add—"Non est inconveniens dicere, quod tales revelationes non fuerunt a Deo." "It is not unseemly to assert, that such revelations did not proceed from God."

We think we may say the same of Pope Pius IX.'s decree, in which he told the world, on the 8th December, 1854, the same things which St. Brigit is said to have done in 1373.

DOCTOR CULLEN ON THE TRUE SENSE OF SCRIPTURE.

Dr. Cullen, "the Archbishop and Legate," in his new Pastoral of 23rd January last, undertakes to explain the Scriptures concerning the purification of the Blessed Virgin, and the presentation of Christ in the Temple. It is natural that Roman Catholics should attach great importance, and rely with great assurance, on explanations of Scripture delivered by an Archbishop who is Legate to the Pope. They believe that their Church alone can give the true sense of Scripture. But, then, how are they to know with certainty what sense their Church puts upon it? The few notes now left in the Douay Bible are declared to be without authority—"the Church" is not responsible for those notes.

The following extract, from Bishop Milner's "End of Controversy," seems to give the nearest approach to any certainty that a Roman Catholic can have for the true explanation of Scripture:—

"The Catholic peasant learns the doctrine of the Church from his parish priest; but, then, he knows that the doctrine of this priest must be conformable to that of his Bishop, and that otherwise he will soon be called to account for it; he knows, also, that the doctrine of the Bishop must be conformable to that of the other Bishops and the Pope."—(Letter 12.)

* Theologice Mystice incida demonstratio per D. Raymundum a Vineis Capuanum, &c., Colon 1553. Folio clxxx. b.

† S. Catharina Senensis ex multis Orationibus xxii., insigniter pia ab ipsa quidem in rapto et extasi ad Deum magno spiritus fervore prolata, verum a sibi assistentibus familiaribus exceptæ, latinè tunc donatæ.

‡ Revel. S. Birgittæ, p. 393. Colon. 1628.

§ Suarez, on 3 pars D. Thomæ Quæst. 27. Disput. iii., sec. v., p. 24, col. 2., ed. Moquignus, 1634.

|| Salmeron Commentarii. Rom. 5. Disput. 52, tom. 13, p. 478. Colon. 1604.

¶ See Antonini Opera tertia pars, p. 69 i. Lugdun, 1587. De S. Catharina Senensi, tit. xxiii., c. xiv., sec. iv. "Reverti ipse M. Raimundus compilator legendæ plus quam ex secreto confessionis habuit, nihil quod pertinet ad viam salutis eam habuisse ab homine, sed per revelationem Jesu Christi per occultam inspirationem, et aliquando per claram apparitionem loquentis sibi, sicut homo loquitur homini."

* Epistole et oratione della Seraphica vergine santa Catharina de Sienna. In Venetia appresso Federico Torresano. MDCXLVIII. Oratione xliii., p. 236.

† Dato e a noi el Verbo Eterno per le mani di Maria. Et de la substantia de Maria si vesti de la natura nostra senza macola di peccato originale; per che quella conceptione non fu per operatione di homo ma per operatione de lo Spirito Sancto: la quale cosa non fu così in Maria. Impercio che ella procedette de la massa de Adam: non per operatione de lo Spirito Sancto, ma di homo. Et per che tutta quella massa era putrida e corrotta, pero non si poteva infondere quella anima in materia non corrotta: ne propriamente el poteva purgare se non per gratia de Spirito Sancto: la quale gratia corpo non puo ricevere ma spirito ragionevole, o intellectuale: et pero Maria non pote essere purgata di quella machia se non poi che lanima fu infusa nel corpo: la quale cosa così fu facta per reverentia del Verbo Divino: el quale doveva intrare in quello vascello: Impercio che si come la fornace in poco dhora consuma la goccia de laqua: così fece lo Spirito Sancto de la machia del peccato originale; per che doppo la conceptione sua subito fu mondata da quello peccato et sulli data grande gratia.

The same passage occurs in a still earlier Italian edition, preserved in the Library of the Irish Museum, printed A.D. 1500, and entitled "Epistole devotissime de Sancta Catharina da Siena. . . . adunate insieme con grandissima diligentia. . . . per li Venerabili servo di Dio frate Bartholomeo d'Alzano da Bergamo del ordine de la observantia de li frati Predicatori. . . . Stampato in la inculta città de Venetia in Casa de Aldo Manutio Romano, a di xv. settembre, MCCCCC."

* We have also seen an edition of the same work printed at Rome in the same year, 1628, which belonged to Bishop Stillingfleet, and is preserved in Archbishop Marsh's Library in Dublin. "Convenirent carne contra voluntatem suam ex divina dilectione. Facto autem corpore meo, Deus animam creatam immixxit corpori et mox anima cum corpore Sanctificata est." Lib. i., cap. ix., p. 11.

† Ego concepta fui sine peccato originali et non in peccato, quia sicut filius meus, et ego, nunquam peccavimus, illi nullum conjugium fuit quod honestus esset quam illud de quo processi."—Lib. 6, cap. 49, p. 392.

‡ Beata Birgide revelatum dicitur B. Virginem præservatam esse ab originali peccato. Sed hoc probabilissimè valde exigua est, tum quia contra tot Sanctos, et nullus est inter istos Sanctos. Sanctæ autem Birgide e regione ponitur Sancta Catharina de Senis quæ dixit sibi revelatum esse oppositum. Et majori fide digna videtur S. Catharina.†. Cajetani Cardinalis Opuscula, August, Taur. 1682, tom. ii., c. 5 p. 206.

* We confess we entertain some doubts of this approbation, having already, in our last number, p. 7, given our readers a passage from an unquoted work of Cardinal de Torquemada (Turre-Cremata), showing that he disbelieved the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception as much as Cardinal Cajetan did. Torquemada died in 1468, and the earliest edition of the revelations of St. Brigit, which we have been probationary, were not published till 1628.

† As Mr. Duffy in his author does not give any reference, and we have not time at present to search for the passage in the original, we present it to our readers, on the authority of Dr. Cullen, under whose approbation the work is sold, and recommended to the perusal of all faithful Christians.—See Mr. Duffy's Catalogue, p. 31.

‡ Bellarm. Disput. tom. iv., p. 249. Paris ed. 1608. "Accedunt postremo revelationes divine quas de hac re habuissit S. Birgitta testatur in lib. i. c. 9, and lib. 6, c. 49 and 55, quæ quidem revelationes contemnendæ non sunt, cum a viris gravissimis diligenter excussæ et approbate fuerint."

§ There referred to as No. xvi. It appears there were 25 orations, of which the Cologne edition gives only 22.—See Echard, quoted infra, p. 837.

|| Tom ii., p. 832. Paris ed., 1721.

¶ Summa Divi Antonini. Lugdun, 1542, pars i., tit. 8, cap. 2. "Et si dicitur aliquas sanctas habuisse revelationes de hominibus ut S. Brigit, sciendum, quod hæc sanctæ, quæ clarescunt miraculis, ut beata Catharina de Senis, hæquent revelationem de contrariis."

We have also seen the earlier edition, printed at Bale and Strasburg, Argent 1496, in which the same passage occurs.

We suppose no better or more certain way can be shown by which a Roman Catholic can learn what the Church of Rome considers the true sense of Scripture. Dr. Cullen being a Bishop of the Roman Church, and also Legate of the Pope, must be considered by Roman Catholics as the highest authority in this country on the true sense of Scripture; and, according to Roman Catholic notions, the only way to find out with certainty whether he is right or whether he has made any mistake, is to find out whether his explanation of Scripture is conformable to all the other Bishops in the world and the Pope. But no Roman Catholic in Ireland has any means of finding out this; so no Roman Catholic can find out whether Dr. Cullen has explained Scripture rightly or wrongly; and if Dr. Cullen goes wrong, all Roman Catholics are brought into hopeless error.

WE have another way of finding out whether Dr. Cullen be right or wrong in his explanations of Scripture—viz., by reading the Scripture itself, and comparing one place with another; and having done this, we think we are able to show, *first*, that Dr. Cullen's explanation of the passages of Scripture referred to in this pastoral is based upon evident blunders and perversions; *secondly*, that any intelligent person who carefully compares the Scripture, could find this out as well as we. This is a strong statement; but we are prepared to prove it.

The passage of Scripture which relates to the purification of the Blessed Virgin, and the presentation of Christ in the Temple, is this—"And after the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they (Joseph and Mary) carried him (Jesus) to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord." As it is written in the law of the Lord, "Every male opening the womb shall be called holy to the Lord," and to offer a sacrifice, according as it is written in the law of the Lord, a pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons. And behold there was a man in Jerusalem named Simeon, and this man was just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel, and the Holy Ghost was in him; and he had received an answer from the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death, before he had seen the Christ of the Lord. And he came by the Spirit into the Temple. And when his parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for him according to the custom of the law, he also took him into his arms and blessed God, and said," &c.—Luke, ch. ii., v. 22-28, Douay Bible.

As respects the rite of purification of the mother among the Jews, Dr. Cullen says: "This ordinance was introduced with the view of impressing on the minds of the faithful the memory of their original guilt, and of the stains of sin which accompany their entrance into the world." With this we find no fault; but Dr. Cullen seems to have felt that it was rather awkward that the immaculate Virgin should undergo a rite of purification which expressed nothing but original sin. He therefore goes on: "The Blessed Virgin, pure and immaculate as she was, and exempt from every stain of sin, whether actual or original, was not subject to this law; yet, to leave us an example of perfect obedience and humility, she submitted to the same ordinances that were prescribed for others, and offered the sacrifices which were required from those who were bound to perform the rite of purification."—Pastoral, p. 4.

This evidently is intended to convey, that the rite of purification was not prescribed by the law of God to the Blessed Virgin, as it was to other Jewish women; but that she, notwithstanding, took upon herself by her own voluntary choice to undergo it. Now, if the Blessed Virgin had known that she herself, alone of all mankind, had never been subject to original sin, and if she had known that this was to be an article of the Christian faith, and if she had known that God, in consequence, did not prescribe for her the rite of purification, we think her taking that rite on herself would have been very like misleading both Jews and Christians about an essential article of the Christian faith. Perhaps it was *this* that has led the Church of Rome herself to fall into the serious blunder or sin of allowing a liberty to all Christians for 1800 years to disbelieve what they now call an article of Christian faith!

But we can prove that Dr. Cullen is entirely wrong in this matter, and that the Blessed Virgin was "subject to this law" of purification, and would have sinned against the law of God given to the Jews, if she had not observed it.

To prove this we need only refer to one verse, written by St. Paul: "When the fulness of time was come, God sent his Son, made of a woman, made under the law."—Galatians, ch. iv., v. 4, Douay Bible.

The Greek word here twice translated "made," is γενημενον. The exact and literal translation of it is "born." Jesus was, therefore, "born under the law;" his birth was "under the law;" and it necessarily follows that his Blessed Mother was, in respect of that birth, "subject to the law" under which He was born.

But Dr. Cullen commits still greater errors when he comes to speak of the presentation of Christ (pastoral, p. 5). He refers to Exodus xiii. for the law of the first-born among the Jews; and then he goes on—"It was in accordance with this law that the holy Virgin ascended to the Temple, bearing her divine infant in her arms, to present Him to his Eternal Father, and to offer the sacrifices by which the first-born were to be redeemed."

This teaches—*first*, that the first-born among the Jews were redeemed by sacrifices; *secondly*, that sacrifice for

sin was offered for our Saviour. Both these things are wholly untrue; for,

1. The first-born among the Jews were not redeemed by sacrifices, but with money.

2. The sacrifices offered on that occasion, were entirely for the purification of the Blessed Virgin herself, and not at all for the "redeeming" of our Lord.

Any one who reads the Scriptures carefully may find for himself that these things were so.

To make the matter plain, however, we must go a little more fully into the law of Moses about the first-born than Dr. Cullen has thought it necessary to do.

That law was established in consequence of God having delivered the people of Israel out of Egypt by slaying all the first-born of the Egyptians. In memory of this, God required that all the first-born of the Israelites should be dedicated to his service.—Exodus xii. 29-31; xiii. 2, 12-16.

These were the words of the law—"Sanctify unto me every first-born that openeth the womb among the children of Israel, as well of men as of beasts."—Exodus xiii. 2. This law applied to the first-born of beasts as well as of men. But a further direction was given for the first-born of men—"Every first-born of men thou shalt redeem with a price" (verse 13). This liberty of "redeeming" was allowed also for animals which it was not lawful to offer in sacrifice, such as an ass (verse 13); but it was not allowed for the first-born of cows, or goats, or sheep. It was binding to offer these in sacrifice, and unlawful to redeem them.

This dedication of the first-born to God was first put in practice at Mount Sinai, one year after they came out of Egypt; because the service of God could not be commenced until the tabernacle was made for that service; and until then there could be no dedication of men or animals to that service.

When the tabernacle was made, all the first-born should have been set apart for the service of God in the tabernacle. But God directed Moses to make an exchange. "The Lord said to Moses, number the first-born of the male sex of the children of Israel . . . and thou shalt take the Levites to me for all the first-born of the children of Israel."—Numbers iii. 40, 41.

But the Levites were only 22,000 (verse 39), and the first-born were 22,273; so it was necessary that the 273 first-born who were not exchanged should be redeemed. So God said to Moses—"But for the price of the 273 of the first-born of the children of Israel that exceed the number of the Levites, thou shalt take five shekels* for every head, according to the weight of the sanctuary. A shekel hath twenty obols. And thou shalt give the money to Aaron and his sons, the price of them that are above. Moses, therefore, took the money of them that were above, and whom they had redeemed from the Levites."—Numbers iii. 46-49.

This determines the first point we have to prove. The first-born among the Jews were redeemed with money, not with sacrifice; and this was said expressly when the law was given. "Every first-born of men thou shalt redeem with a price."—Exodus xiii. 13. And in Numbers xviii. 16, it is said again, "The redemption of it shall be after one month, for five shekels of silver." There is not one word in the law of Moses about the first-born being redeemed with sacrifice. So much for the first point we undertook to prove.

The second point we undertook to prove was this, that the sacrifices offered on that occasion were entirely for the purification of the Blessed Virgin, and not at all for Jesus Christ.

To prove this, we have only to refer to Leviticus, chap. xii. 6-8, Douay Bible: "When the days of her purification are expired, for a son, or for a daughter, she shall bring to the door of the tabernacle of the testimony a lamb of a year old for a holocaust,* and a young pigeon or a turtle for sin, and shall deliver them to the priest, who shall offer them before the Lord, and shall pray for her, and so she shall be cleansed . . . and if her hand find not sufficiency, and she is not able to offer a lamb, she shall take two turtles, or two young pigeons, one for a holocaust, and the other for sin; and the priest shall pray for her, and so she shall be cleansed."

This was done for the Blessed Virgin. Sacrifice for sin was offered for her, because the law of God required that it should be offered for her.

This sacrifice had to be offered for the purification of the mother at the birth of every child, and for a female as well as for a male. It is clear, therefore, that the sacrifice was not for the redeeming of the first-born male, but for the purification of the mother.

The law of Moses did not prescribe any sacrifice for the "first-born;" therefore, none was offered for Christ.

"Sacrifice for sin" offered for Christ! For Him who was HIMSELF the SIN-OFFERING for the whole world! The very thought is blasphemy against Him who alone was without sin. FOR HIM ALONE, of all who ever have partaken of Adam's nature, no sacrifice for sin EVER WAS OR COULD BE OFFERED.

Our readers will now know how to estimate the accuracy of Dr. Cullen's knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, when he says:—

* The "shekel," or shekel, was a piece of money worth about two shillings and three pence.
* That is, a burnt offering.

First; that the first-born of the Jews were redeemed by sacrifice.

Secondly; that SACRIFICE FOR SIN was offered FOR CHRIST!!!

Is it not a sad thing to see at the head of any Church a man apparently so little used to study the Scriptures; and, consequently, ignorant of what any simple scripture reader would be able to tell him?

Dr. Cullen seems, indeed, but slightly acquainted with the light which the Old Testament scriptures throw on the person, the character, and the office of the Saviour—a melancholy proof of the evil results of closing the Holy Scriptures against the great mass of mankind, who otherwise could not fail to detect for themselves the ignorance which seems to "absorb in death" the highest dignitaries and prelates of the Church of Rome.

If it could be of any avail, we would earnestly and affectionately entreat Dr. Cullen to "search the Scriptures, which testify of Christ" (John v. 39), as he will answer for it to the great Head of the Church at the great day; and to publish another pastoral to set the millions right whom he has now tried to set wrong with all the weight of authority which belongs to his position.

But we know full well that they who have undertaken the service of Rome, as her agents for establishing the false worship of a creature, which she has set up, will go through with their awful task. Many of them, perhaps, would bring Christ Himself under sin, sooner than admit that his blessed mother was subject to it, and needed to be redeemed by Him.

Our readers, at least, are now in a position to judge what explanations of Scripture they are likely to get from the highest authorities of the Church of Rome. They will see that their teachers are not infallible; but that plain men can correct the errors of those teachers about the Scriptures, by going to the Scriptures themselves.

And Dr. Cullen himself will, perhaps, be more careful in meddling with Scripture, when he next shall venture to denounce the CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

NEWS FROM DUBLIN.

What News Bill Condon brought down from Dublin, and told Thade Carthy, on Carrigabrick Hill, when he met him carting home the Potatoes.

Bill. Good morrow, Thade—are they good with you: I never see finer than they have down the country.

Thade. Middling enough, except the "Forty-fours"—most of them black, not fit for pigs. But where were you from us this long time, Bill? The neighbours have it that you travelled as far as Dublin.

B. That I did, and see more of them I could tell you in a twelvemonth.

T. But whisper?—did you hear anything down there about our holy religion?

B. Wisha, let me alone, you're always about that. But maybe, Thady, I heard something that you wouldn't like to hear.

T. How so, Bill? Is the jubilee put off?

B. No, but I heard something since, and if you'll promise not to inform I'll tell you.

T. Why should I inform against a neighbour's child? I tell you, Bill, I'm not so great latterly with them at all. I mind my duty and no more.

B. Well, to begin my story:—I was lodging in Dublin, in St. James's-street, and in the second bed there was sleeping a decent-looking man (so the woman of the house told me), he and I alone, in the front room. Well, the first night I was dog tired and hurried into bed, and not being used to strangers, I was mighty uneasy about the man that was to be in the room with me. Maybe, says I, he'll rob me—as Jack Coleman lost his duds when he went up to the Exhibition. So says I to myself, I won't close my eyes till I see him safe in bed. With that, I waited till he walked in with a candle in his hand, and over he goes to the table, and takes a book out of his pocket, and after lifting up his eyes, as if he was afraid of the ceiling, he began reading this book, for twenty minutes, or more. Sometimes he would sigh, sometimes put his hand on his forehead, till at last, looking over at me, and seeing my eyes closed, down with him on his knees and began his prayers half aloud, and indeed what he said of himself made me at first very uneasy at being in the same room with him; for of all the sinners in the world, if you were to believe himself, he was the worst. What do you think of him that said that he broke all the commandments, and that if he had his due he ought to have been in hell.

T. I suppose you put your purse into your breeches' pocket and put it under your head. That's the safest place, Bill, when you're sleeping in dangerous company.

B. But, Thade, I was not long afraid of him; for, by-and-bye, he began talking to God, as if He was in the room with us, telling Him that He promised him something, and saying that he wouldn't get off his knees until he got it. And he used to say again and again, did not the Saviour pay for it—did not Jesus Christ finish it. And somehow, I began to be more afraid at thinking God was so near me than I was of having, maybe, a rogue in the room. At last he changed his notes, and began thanking God, and I could see by the candle the

* This expression is Dr. Cullen's; p. 5 of the Pastoral.